

KIM GILBERT EBRON
 7625 DEAN MARTIN DRIVE, SUITE 110
 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89139
 (702) 485-3300 FAX (702) 485-3301

DIANA S. EBRON, ESQ.
 Nevada Bar No. 10580
 E-mail: diana@kgelegal.com
 KAREN L. HANKS, ESQ.
 Nevada Bar No. 9578
 E-mail: karen@kgelegal.com
 KIM GILBERT EBRON
 7625 Dean Martin Drive, Suite 110
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89139
 Telephone: (702) 485-3300
 Facsimile: (702) 485-3301
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Joshua H. Crittendon

**UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
 DISTRICT OF NEVADA**

JOSHUA H. CRITTENDON,

 Plaintiff,

 vs.

 JOE LOMBARDO, et al.,

 Defendants.

Case No.: 2:17-cv-1700-RFB-BNW

**PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXCEED
 PAGE LIMIT AS TO:
 (1) PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO
 DEFENDANT LARRY WILLIAMSON,
 M.D.'S RESPONSE IN OPPOSITION
 TO PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO
 AMEND; AND
 (2) PLAINTIFF'S REPLY TO LVMPD
 DEFENDANTS' RESPONSE TO
 PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO AMEND**

Plaintiff Joshua H. Crittendon, by and through his counsel of record, Diana S. Ebron, Esq., hereby files his Motion to Exceed Page Limit under LR 7-3. This motion is based on the Declaration of Diana S. Ebron, Esq., the following memorandum of points and authorities, the papers and pleading herein, any argument heard by the Court on this matter.

**DECLARATION OF DIANA S. EBRON, ESQ. IN SUPPORT
 OF PLAINTIFF'S MOTION TO EXCEED PAGE LIMIT**

I, Diana S. Ebron, Esq., hereby declare as follows:

1. I am an attorney with the law firm of Kim Gilbert Ebron, and am admitted to practice in all courts in the State of Nevada and in this Court.
2. I have personal knowledge of the facts set forth herein.
3. I represent Plaintiff Joshua H. Crittendon ("Crittendon") in the above-captioned matter.
4. I submit this declaration in support of Plaintiff's Motion to Exceed Page Limit.
5. On January 20, 2021, Crittendon filed his Motion to Amend [ECF No. 223] ("Motion").

KIM GILBERT EBON
 7625 DEAN MARTIN DRIVE, SUITE 110
 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89139
 (702) 485-3300 FAX (702) 485-3301

6. On February 3, 2021, Defendant Larry Williamson filed his response in opposition to Crittendon's Motion [ECF No. 226] ("Williamson's Response").
 7. Williamson's Response is 21 pages long, and raises at least seven distinct bases for rejecting Crittendon's Motion.
 8. On February 3, 2021, the LVMPD Defendants filed their response in opposition to Crittendon's Motion [ECF No. 227] ("LVMPD's Response").
 9. LVMPD's Response is 20 pages long, and raises at least nine distinct bases for rejecting Crittendon's Motion.
 10. Certain issues raised in Williamson's Response and LVMPD's Response require particularly thorough discussion. This is especially true of the futility arguments—which are tantamount to a separate motions to dismiss included within each response—as well as extensive procedural arguments made in both briefs.
 11. A 15 page reply as to Williamson's Response and to LVMPD's Response—excluding table of contents, table of authorities, certificate of service, and any exhibits—is necessary for Crittendon to fully articulate his position.
 12. This motion is made for a proper purpose and supported by good cause, as set forth above.
- I declare under penalty of perjury that the foregoing is true and correct.
- Executed this 10th day of February, 2021.

/s/ Diana S. Ebron
 Diana S. Ebron, Esq.

MEMORANDUM OF POINTS AND AUTHORITIES

On January 20, 2021, Crittendon filed his Motion to Amend [ECF No. 223] ("Motion"). On February 3, 2021, Defendant Larry Williamson filed his response to Crittendon's Motion [ECF No. 226] ("Williamson's Response"). On February 3, 2021, the LVMPD Defendants filed their response to Crittendon's Motion [ECF No. 227] ("LVMPD's Response"). Crittendon's replies to Williamson's Response and LVMPD's Response are due February 10, 2021.

LR 7-3(a) allows 12 pages for a reply in support of a motion. Crittendon's replies to Williamson's Response and LVMPD's Response are each 15 pages in length. Consistent with LR

KIM GILBERT EBRON
 7625 DEAN MARTIN DRIVE, SUITE 110
 LAS VEGAS, NEVADA 89139
 (702) 485-3300 FAX (702) 485-3301

7-3(c), this Motion to Exceed Page Limit is supported by a declaration stating the reasons additional pages are needed and identifying the number of total pages needed as 15 for each reply, excluding table of contents, table of authorities, certificate of service, and any exhibits.

This case involves, *inter alia*, constitutional claims of excessive force, failure to protect, constitutional deliberate indifference to serious medical needs, first amendment retaliation, and state law claims of assault and battery, and negligence and negligent hiring, retention, supervision, and training. Williamson's Response is 21 pages long, and raises at least seven distinct bases for rejecting Crittendon's Motion. LVMPD's Response is 20 pages long, and raises at least nine distinct bases for rejecting Crittendon's Motion. Certain issues raised in Williamson's Response and LVMPD's Response require particularly thorough discussion. This is especially true of the futility arguments in both briefs, which are tantamount to a separate motions to dismiss included within each response, and lengthy procedural arguments made in both briefs. Crittendon's replies only narrowly exceed the page limits set forth in LR 7-3.

To properly articulate his position, Crittendon requires a 15 page reply brief as to Williamson's Response and LVMPD's Response—excluding table of contents, table of authorities, certificate of service, and any exhibits. The table of contents and table of authorities required under LR 7-3(c) appear in both replies.

CONCLUSION

For the reasons set forth above, Crittendon respectfully requests that the Court grant his Motion to Exceed Page Limit.

Dated: February 10, 2021.

KIM GILBERT EBRON

ORDER

IT IS SO ORDERED

DATED: 10:29 am, February 16, 2021


BRENDA WEKSLER
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

/s/ Diana S. Ebron
 DIANA S. EBRON, ESQ.
 Nevada Bar No. 10580
 KAREN L. HANKS, ESQ.
 Nevada Bar No. 9578
 7625 Dean Martin Drive, Suite 110
 Las Vegas, Nevada 89139
Attorneys for Plaintiff
Joshua H. Crittendon